

# Zgodovinski časopis

HISTORICAL REVIEW

ZČ | Ljubljana | 78 | 2024 | št. 1-2 (169) | str. 1–262



Rajko Bratož, *Marcellinus von Dalmatien und die Frage der Verselbständigung Dalmatiens zu seiner Zeit* • Svit Komel, *Vpliv katastrskih popisov na izvedbo zemljiške odveze na Kranjskem* • Miha Zobec, *Tomajski posestnik in politik Anton Černe (1813-1891) med Dunajem in izvorno skupnostjo: pogled na življenjsko pot vaškega mogotca* • Tomasz Jacek Lis, *Austrian-Croat relations in Habsburg Bosnia and Herzegovina* • Žarko Leković, *An overview of Political, Diplomatic and Social Affairs in Montenegro on the Eve of the First World War* • Biljana Ristić, *Vojaške bolnišnice in pokopališče v Škofji Loki* • Oto Luthar, *Poletje s Tukididom. O nekaterih aktualnih vprašanjih zgodovinopisja*

# Zgodovinski časopis

HISTORICAL REVIEW

ZČ | Ljubljana | 78 | 2024 | št. 1-2 (169) | str. 1-262



Izdaja  
ZVEZA ZGODOVINSKIH DRUŠTEV SLOVENIJE  
Ljubljana

## GLASILO ZVEZE ZGODOVINSKIH DRUŠTEV SLOVENIJE

Mednarodni uredniški odbor: dr. Kornelija Ajlec (SI), dr. Tina Bahovec (SI),  
dr. Bojan Balkovec (SI) (tehnični urednik), dr. Rajko Bratož (SI),  
dr. Ernst Bruckmüller (AT), dr. Liliana Ferrari (IT), dr. Ivo Goldstein (HR),  
dr. Žarko Lazarevič (SI), dr. Dušan Mlacović (SI) (namestnik odgovornega  
urednika), dr. Božo Repe (SI), dr. Franc Rozman (SI), Janez Stergar (SI),  
dr. Imre Szilágyi (H), dr. Peter Štih (SI) (odgovorni urednik), dr. Marta  
Verginella (SI), dr. Peter Vodopivec (SI), dr. Marija Wakounig (AT)

Za vsebino prispevkov so odgovorni avtorji, prav tako morajo poskrbeti za  
avtorske pravice za objavljeno slikovno in drugo gradivo, v kolikor je to  
potrebno. Ponatis člankov in slik je mogoč samo z dovoljenjem uredništva in  
navedbo vira.



Redakcija tega zvezka je bila zaključena 10. april 2024.

Oblikovanje in oprema: Vesna Vidmar

Sedež uredništva in uprave: Oddelek za zgodovino Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani,  
Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenija, tel.: (01) 241-1200,  
e-pošta: [info@zgodovinskicasopis.si](mailto:info@zgodovinskicasopis.si); <http://www.zgodovinskicasopis.si>

Letna naročnina: za leto/letnik 2024: za nečlane in zavode 32 €, za društvene člane 24 €,  
za društvene člane – upokoјence 18 €, za društvene člane – študente 12 €.   
Cena tega zvezka v prosti prodaji je 16 € (z vključenim DDV).

Naročnina za tujino znaša za ustanove 45 €, za posameznike 35 €  
in za študente 25 €.

Plačuje se na transakcijski račun: SI 56020 1 000 12083935  
Zveza Zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana,  
Slovenija  
Nova Ljubljanska banka, d.d., Trg Republike 2, 1520 Ljubljana LJBAS12X

Sofinancirajo: Publikacija izhaja s finančno pomočjo Javne agencije za raziskovalno  
dejavnost RS

Prelom: ABO grafika d.o.o. – zanjo Igor Kogelnik

Tisk: ABO grafika d.o.o., Ljubljana, maj 2024

Naklada: 500 izvodov

Zgodovinski časopis je evidentiran v naslednjih mednarodnih podatkovnih  
bazah: Scopus, European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH),  
Historical Abstracts, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences,  
ABC CLIO, America: History and Life, Bibliography of the History of Art,  
Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, Russian Academy of Sciences Bibliographies.

<http://www.zgodovinskicasopis.si>  
[info@zgodovinskicasopis.si](mailto:info@zgodovinskicasopis.si)



ISSN 0350-5774	
UDK	949.712(05)
UDC	

## BULLETIN OF THE HISTORICAL ASSOCIATION OF SLOVENIA (HAS)

International Editorial Board: Kornelija Ajlec, PhD, (SI), Tina Bahovec, PhD, (SI), Bojan Balkovec, PhD, (SI) (Technical Editor), Rajko Bratož, PhD, (SI), Ernst Bruckmüller, PhD, (AT), Liliana Ferrari, PhD, (IT), Ivo Goldstein, PhD, (HR), Žarko Lazarević, PhD, (SI), Dušan Mlacović, PhD, (SI) (Deputy Editor-in-Charge), Božo Repe, PhD, (SI), Franc Rozman, PhD, (SI), Janez Stergar (SI), Imre Szilágyi, PhD, (H), Peter Štih, PhD, (SI) (Editor-in-Chief), Marta Verginella, PhD, (SI), Peter Vodopivec, PhD, (SI), Marija Wakounig, PhD, (AT)

The authors are responsible for the contents of their articles, they must also secure copyrights for the published photographs and figures when necessary. Reprints of articles, photographs, and graphic material are only allowed with explicit permission of the editorial office and must be cited as sources.



The editing of this issue was completed on April 10, 2024.

Design: Vesna Vidmar

Headquarters and Mailing Address: Oddelek za zgodovino Filozofske fakultete v Ljubljani, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana, Slovenia, phone: +386 1 241-1200, e-mail: [info@zgodovinskiasopis.si](mailto:info@zgodovinskiasopis.si); <http://www.zgodovinskiasopis.si>

Annual Subscription Fee (for 2024): non-members and institutions 32 €, HAS members 24 €, retired HAS members 18 €, student HAS members 12 €.

Price: 16 € (VAT included).

Subscription Fee: foreign institutions 45 €, individual subscription 35 €, student subscription 25 €  
Transaction Account Number: SI 56020 1 000 12083935  
Zveza Zgodovinskih društev Slovenije, Aškerčeva 2, 1000 Ljubljana,  
Nova Ljubljanska banka, d.d., Trg Republike 2,  
1520 Ljubljana LJBASI2X

Co-Financed by: Slovenian Research Agency

Printed by: ABO grafika d.o.o., Ljubljana, May 2024

Print Run: 500 copies

Historical Review is included in the following international databases: Scopus, European Reference Index for the Humanities (ERIH), Historical Abstracts, International Bibliography of the Social Sciences, ABC CLIO, America: History and Life, Bibliography of the History of Art, Ulrich's Periodicals Directory, Russian Academy of Sciences Bibliographies.

<http://www.zgodovinskiasopis.si>  
[info@zgodovinskiasopis.si](mailto:info@zgodovinskiasopis.si)



ISSN 0350-5774	
UDK	949.712(05)
UDC	

## KAZALO – CONTENTS

### Razprave – Studies

- Rajko **Bratož**, Marcellinus von Dalmatien und die Frage der  
Verselbständigung Dalmatiens zu seiner Zeit .....8–29  
Marcelin iz Dalmacije in vprašanje osamosvojitve  
Dalmacije v njegovem času
- Svit **Komel**, Vpliv katastrskih popisov na izvedbo zemljiške  
odveze na Kranjskem .....30–99  
Land surveyor's relief: The influence of cadastral surveys  
on the execution of the land relief in Carniola
- Miha **Zobec**, Tomajski posestnik in politik Anton Černe (1813-1891)  
med Dunajem in izvorno skupnostjo: pogled na življenjsko pot  
vaškega mogotca ..... 100–119  
Tomaj landowner and politician Anton Černe (1813-1891)  
between Vienna and his community of origin:  
a close-up look at the life of a village tycoon
- Tomasz **Jacek Lis**, Austrian-Croat relations in Habsburg  
Bosnia and Herzegovina ..... 120–147  
Avstrijsko-hrvaški odnosi v habsburški Bosni in Hercegovini
- Žarko **Leković**, An overview of Political, Diplomatic and Social  
Affairs in Montenegro on the Eve of the First World War ..... 148–166  
Pregled političnih, diplomatskih in družbenih razmer  
v Črni gori na predvečer prve svetovne vojne
- Biljana **Ristić**, Vojaške bolnišnice in pokopališče v Škofji Loki ..... 168–190  
The Field Hospitals and Military Cemetery in Škofja Loka
- Oto **Luthar**, Poletje s Tukididom. O nekaterih aktualnih  
vprašanjih zgodovinarstva ..... 192–215  
Summer with Thucydides. On Some Current  
Questions of Historiography

### **Jubileji – Anniversaries**

Osemdeset let prof. dr. Janka Prunka (Jure Perovšek) .....	218–221
Janko Prunk – An Octogenerian	
Salvator Žitko – osemdesetletnik (Dušan Mlacović) .....	222–224
Salvator Žiško – An Octogenerian	
Metod Benedik – osemdesetletnik (Bogdan Kolar) .....	225–228
Metod Benedik – An Octogenerian	

### **V spomin – In memoriam**

Ana Benedetič (Tatjana Dekleva) .....	230–232
Miloš Fon (Rajko Bratož) .....	233

### **Kongresi in simpoziji – Congresses, Symposia**

Poletna šola Okoljska zgodovina in historična ekologija Dinarskega krasa (Ljubljana, 25.–30. september 2023) (Brina Kotar) .....	236–238
Summer School Environmental History and Historical Ecology of the Dinaric Karst	

## Ocene in poročila – Reviews and Reports

Žarko Lazarevič, Marta Rendla, Janja Sedlaček, Zgodovina zadružništva v Sloveniji (1856–1992) (Bojan Balkovec) .....	240–242
Ana Cergol Paradiž, »Bela kuga«: ilegalni abortusi in zmanjševanje rodnosti na Slovenskem v obdobju med obema vojnama (Irena Selišnik) .....	243–245
Daniel Siter, Rogaška Slatina pod kljukastim križem: zdravilišče med okupacijo 1941–1945 (Tomaž Teropšič) .....	246–248
Robovi, stičišča in utopije prijateljstva. Spregledane kulturne izmenjave v senci politike (Žiga Smolič) .....	249–253
Julie Rak, False Summit: Gender in Mountaineering Nonfiction (Julija Šuligoj) .....	254–258

\* \* \*

Navodila avtorjem prispevkov za Zgodovinski časopis .....	259–262
Instructions for Authors	

# Razprave



Tomasz Jacek Lis  
Austrian-Croat relations in  
Habsburg Bosnia and Herzegovina

**LIS, Tomasz Jacek**, PhD, Assistant, Faculty of History, Jagiellonian University, Krakow, PL-31-007 Kraków, Gołębia 13, t.lis@uj.edu.pl

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0188-5755>

**Austrian-Croat relations in Habsburg Bosnia and Herzegovina**

**Zgodovinski časopis (Historical Review)**, Ljubljana 78/2024 (169), No. 1–2, pp. 120-147, 113 Notes.

Language: En. (Sn., En., Sn.)

In the paper, I show some parts of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarian control after the Congress of Berlin (1878). I focused on the influence of Croatian intellectual elites on this country, particularly on the context of Croatian influences on the process of Bosnian Muslim nationalization. Additionally, I want to show the complicated cooperation between the Croat elites and the Austrian government which was in power in Bosnia and Herzegovina at this time.

**Keywords:** Bosnia and Herzegovina under Austro-Hungarians, history of Croats, nationalization, 19th century

**LIS, Tomasz Jacek**, dr., asistent, Zgodovinska fakulteta, Jagelonska univerza v Krakovu, PL-31-007 Kraków, Gołębia 13, t.lis@uj.edu.pl

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0188-5755>

**Avstrijsko-hrvaški odnosi v habsburški Bosni in Hercegovini**

**Zgodovinski časopis**, Ljubljana, 78/2024 (169), št. 1–2, str. 120-147, cit. 113

1.01. izvorni znanstveni članek: jezik En. (Sn., En., Sn.)

V razpravi so prikazani deli zgodovine Bosne in Hercegovine v času avstroogrške oblasti po berlinskem kongresu (1878). Članek se osredotoča na vpliv hrvaških intelektualnih elit v deželi, še posebej na kontekst hrvaških vplivov na procese nacionalizacije tamkajšnjih muslimanov. Poleg tega je prikazano zapleteno sodelovanje hrvaških elit z avstrijsko vlado, ki je v tistem času bila na oblasti v Bosni in Hercegovini.

**Ključne besede:** Bosna in Hercegovina pod Avstro-Ogrsko, zgodovina Hrvatov, nacionalizacija, 19. stoletje

## Introduction<sup>1</sup>

The article focuses on showing how, with the acquiescence of the Austrian authorities, the Croatian national idea developed in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the period 1878–1914. Using education as an example, as well as the activities of scientific and cultural societies, I would like to show how the authorities in Vienna – unable to fully control what was going on in Bosnia and Herzegovina – had to seek compromises and conduct their policy using the involvement of Croats, and, on the other hand, how Croats took advantage of this Austro-Hungarian weakness to conduct their own national activities. And this one was important for both the Croats and the Muslims. My intention is not to prove that the Croats were a tool in the hands of the Austrians, as Serbian propaganda of the late 19th and early 20th centuries often attempted to show,<sup>2</sup> but to point out the difficult relationship between Vienna and Zagreb in the context of the interests that both had in Sarajevo. Although the topic of Croatian activities in Bosnia and Herzegovina has sometimes been present, especially in the older literature,<sup>3</sup> many questions remain open to this day.

In the article at hand, I would like to demonstrate both the Austrian rationale, as well as the Croatian one. I sought to capture these two perspectives because in doing so it can be shown how dependent the two sides were on each other. In the article I had to allow myself some simplifications, particularly in terms of terminology. Naturally, I realize that the terms Croatian and Catholic face each other, which was not always the case, but due to the imperfection of the sources at my disposal, e.g. statistics, which do not refer to nationality but to religion, some simplifications were required in order to show the general trends in the context of the development of education in Bosnia and Herzegovina or the functioning of associations.

In this paper I used sources from the archives of Bosnia and Herzegovina, as well as Croatia, supplementing them with the related source material from other countries, e.g. Poland and the United Kingdom. These documents allow us to scrutinize the situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina from a different perspective,

---

<sup>1</sup> The research presented in this article was financed by the grant of the Polish National Science Center: Social Changes of the Muslim Communities in Bosnia-Herzegovina and Bulgaria in the Second Half of the 19th and at the Beginning of the 20th Century: Comparative Studies (2020/39/B/HS3/01717).

<sup>2</sup> Nastić, *Jezuite u Bosni*, pp. 3–4.

<sup>3</sup> Đaković, *Političke organizacije bosanskohercegovačkih katolika Hrvata*; Gross, *Hrvatska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1878 do 1914*, pp. 6–98.

rather than through the prism of Bosnian or Croatian materials. The sources that I obtained during my research in London are mostly reports created by diplomats to show the economic, social and economic situation in the country. They show the Western point of view on the problem of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Polish sources, on the other hand, created thanks to the large Polish diaspora living in the country during the Austro-Hungarian period, are important for another reason. Culturally AND linguistically speaking, Poles are close; consequently, their materials show “from the inside” the everyday life of the people of Bosnia and Herzegovina. At the same time, unlike the Croats, the Poles did not have any national goals related to the Muslim community. In addition, I used sources that have already been published, e.g. statistics, memoirs and letters, and I also drew on the rich literature on the subject.

### **The role of Croats in the first years of the Austro-Hungarian occupation of Bosnia and Herzegovina**

In 1878, when the Austro-Hungarian army under General Josip Filipović entered the borders of Bosnia and Herzegovina, many Catholics believed that the time would finally come to throw off not only the Ottoman, but especially the Muslim “yoke,” so the black-and-yellow troops were greeted like saviours.<sup>4</sup> This was mentioned by those involved, as well as other independent sources confirming the positive reactions of Christians to the Filipović offensive.<sup>5</sup> However, this is hardly surprising; after all, the country, as a result of decisions made in Berlin, found itself in the sphere of influence of Austria-Hungary – the Catholic monarchy, which was to exercise an international mandate there. This state of affairs significantly changed the social situation.

And this one, in the late 1870s, was disastrous from the Croatian point of view. Since the beginning of the 18<sup>th</sup> century, the Catholic influence in Bosnia had been declining.<sup>6</sup> During the aforementioned period, the local population professing Catholicism was far weaker than the Orthodox or Muslims. Although the statistics we have for the Ottoman period differ and are based mainly on questionable estimates, they agree on one thing. Roman Catholics were numerically the weakest group in the *vilayet* of Bosnia.<sup>7</sup> However, the problem was not only quantity, but also “quality”, i.e. there was a noticeable lack of secular elites among

<sup>4</sup> Martić, *Zapamćenja (1829–1878)*, p. 97.

<sup>5</sup> National Archive in London [NAL], Letter of the British Consul in Sarajevo Edward Freeman to Foreign Office, Sarajevo 22 August 1878, ref. FO 195/1212.

<sup>6</sup> Đaković, *Političke organizacije*, p. 33; Džaja, *Bosna i Hercegovina u austrougarskom razdoblju (1878–1918). Inteligencija između tradicije i ideologije*, p. 41.

<sup>7</sup> The first census was carried out in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1879. At that time, the Catholics constituted 18.08% of the country’s inhabitants, with the Orthodox Christians totaling 42.88% and Muslims 38.73%. Previous population figures were individual estimates and therefore differed significantly. Рор. Гильфердинг, *Собрание сочинений А. Гильфердинга*, pp. 286–287; Roškiewicz, *Studien über Bosnien und die Hercegovin*, pp. 78–82; Bošnjak *Zemljopis i povijest Bosne*, pp. 14–16.

Catholics who could take on cultural and national creative roles. At the head of the *millet* within which Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina functioned were the Franciscans. Although they played a very important role and not only among their faithful, inspiring respect throughout the country, they were clerics, which did not allow them to build such a position as, for instance, the Orthodox rich merchant families, who were not lacking in the large cities.<sup>8</sup> This was very significant because financial elites, e.g. Despić and Jeftinović from Sarajevo, for example, built their position from generation to generation by educating their children abroad (e.g. in Novi Sad or Vienna), who later, richer in experience and contacts, returned to their hometowns thus strengthening the stratum of the local elite.<sup>9</sup>

The Catholic population in Bosnia and Herzegovina was thus sparse and de facto devoid of an elite, so the occupation brought great hope for improving their lot. It was not only Croats from the Bosnian *vilayet* who rejoiced at the results of the Berlin peace talks. Croats from the tri-union Kingdom of Croatia, Slavonia and Dalmatia also expressed joy at this. The opportunity was opening up for “Turkish Croatia”<sup>10</sup> to once again find itself within the borders of the Croatian state. Many representatives of the Croatian secular and clerical elite were convinced that Bosnia and Herzegovina would be united with Croatia in the future, forming a great state.<sup>11</sup> These hopes were so strong that for their sake it was even decided to openly conflict with the Serbs (who also had their ambitions in Bosnia and Herzegovina), and as a consequence, in Dalmatia, there was a final split in the joint Croat-Serbian front directed against the Italian-speaking *Autonomaši*.<sup>12</sup>

Consequently, there was no unity among Croatian politicians as to the position to be taken on the issue of the Austrian occupation in Bosnia-Herzegovina. The milieu centred around Bishop Josip Jurij Strossmayer, a supporter of the idea of Slavic cooperation, believed that the occupation of Bosnia’s *vilayet* would do more harm to the common idea of unifying the southern Slavs than good, since it would be the Germans and Hungarians who would rule there to the detriment of the local population<sup>13</sup>. The breakup of the Serbo-Croatian coalition in Dalmatia was, in a way, a confirmation of the concerns of the Bishop of Đakovo. Interestingly, also the *Pravaša* milieu was initially displeased with such a turn of events, knowing

<sup>8</sup> Dujmović, *U ogledalu promjena – Srpsko građanstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1918–1941*, pp. 63–94; Niškanović, *Despića kuća i zaostavština porodice Despić u zbirci Muzeja grada Sarajeva*, pp. 185–205.

<sup>9</sup> Historijski Ariv Sarajeva [HAS], Porodica Jeftinovići, Korespondencija Gligorije Jeftanović, ref. O-J-283.

<sup>10</sup> Croats often used this term for Bosnia, thus referring to the medieval heritage of the Kingdom of Croatia, which partly included the territories of the vilayet of Bosnia. Usurping, as it were, the right to these territories. Šulek, *Hrvatsko-Ugarski ustav ili konstitucija*, p. 45; Cf. Moaćanin, *Turska Hrvatska: Hrvati pod vlašću Osmanskoga Carstva do 1791: preispitivanja*.

<sup>11</sup> Velikonja, *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance in Bosnia-Herzegovina*, p. 112; Steindorff, *Geschichte Kroatiens. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, pp. 140–141.

<sup>12</sup> This was a population, living in Dalmatia and Istria, that had a sense of local identity associated with Dalmatia and Istria. Antoni Cetnarowicz, *Odrodzenie narodowe w Dalmacji. Od slavenstva do nowoczesnej chorwackiej i serbskiej idei narodowej*, pp. 181–190.

<sup>13</sup> Letter from Strossmayer’s letter to Rački dated 9 May 1878, p. 175

that neither Vienna nor Budapest would ever agree to the merger of Croatian lands within the Austro-Hungarian borders with Bosnia and Herzegovina<sup>14</sup>. Most Croats, however, were in favour of the occupation. However, realistically assessing the situation, rather than a political alliance, they thought of other kinds of possibilities, primarily institutional and cultural strengthening of the Croatian element in the country and thus binding it to Croatian Banovina. Not coincidentally, shortly after the occupation, Vjekoslav Klaić published in Zagreb his book on Bosnia and Herzegovina<sup>15</sup>, in which he referred to it as; *a beautiful Croatian land*,<sup>16</sup> inhabited by the *same Croatian people*<sup>17</sup>. The Austrians were well aware of the mood that prevailed among the Croats, so it is not surprising that they put Croatian General Josip Filipović at the helm of the troops to capture the *vilayet* of Bosnia in 1878. Although loyal to the Habsburg dynasty, he understood perfectly well what chances his countrymen had of having Bosnia and Herzegovina occupied by the Austro-Hungarian army under his command. Once he succeeded, with an unexpectedly strong force, in taking control of the country, one of his first moves was to bring in civilian officials, namely Croats from Banovina and Dalmatia. They knew the language, which was one of the key criteria for their appointment to the civil service. Although the numbers were not large – totalling about a dozen – the accusations of attempting a Croatization of Bosnia quickly emerged.<sup>18</sup> This was the voice of the Hungarians, who were frightened that this situation supported the Slavs. The reliance of his power on Croatian officials was even supposed to be the reason for Filipović's dismissal and his replacement by Wilhelm von Württemberg, who brought officials from other parts of the monarchy (Bohemia, Moravia or Galicia) in place of Croats. Although such a motive cannot be unequivocally ruled out, it should be recalled that Filipović, despite having been militarily successful, could not boast similar achievements in provincial management. According to the then-current British Consul Edward Freeman, Gen. Filipović, whom the consul first encountered on 23 August, shortly after entering Sarajevo, had alienated the Muslims with the aggressive policy that he pursued toward them.<sup>19</sup>

Although Filipović's dismissal meant the return of some of the aforementioned officials, it was not the end of the presence of Croats from Banovina or Dalmatia in Bosnia. On the contrary, the Austrians knew they needed Croats to achieve their goals in the country. However, they had to establish a modern administration first.

In Bosnia and Herzegovina, the main problem that the new authority faced was the lack of suitable cadres from which to create a civilian official corps that

<sup>14</sup> Đaković, *Političke organizacije*, p. 147.

<sup>15</sup> Klaić, *Bosna. Podatci o zemljopisu i povijesti Bosne i Hercegovine*.

<sup>16</sup> Klaić, *Bosna. Podatci o zemljopisu*, p. 1.

<sup>17</sup> Klaić, *Bosna. Podatci o zemljopisu*, p. 74.

<sup>18</sup> Kasumović, *Priliv činovnika iz Austro-Ugarske u Bosnu i Hercegovinu nakon okupacije 1878*, p. 97.

<sup>19</sup> NAL, Letter of the British Consul in Sarajevo Edward Freeman to Foreign Office, Sarajevo 23 January 1879, ref. FO 195/1212; British Library, Manuscripts, Edward Freeman's Diary, 1875–1879, Add MS 59750, 54; Cf. Edin Radušić, *Upostavljanje austrougarske vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini prema izvještajima britanskog konzulata u Sarajevu*, pp. 42–43.

conformed to the Austrian standards. One cannot agree here with the opinion of Hana Younis, who argues that the occupation authorities could have used the remaining Muslim elites in the country, but due to prejudice they refused to do so, so they replaced *the educated, with people without adequate education*.<sup>20</sup> Well, the situation was quite different from what the Sarajevo historian claims. Muslims who remained in the country were, generally speaking, particularly at the beginning of the occupation, hostile to the new authorities – the attitude of servility that characterized the behaviour of Mehmed beg-Kapetanović Ljubušak was more of an exception,<sup>21</sup> rather than a rule. Of course, over time, more and more people became convinced of the new authorities, and it even happened that Muslims who fought against the Austro-Hungarian army in 1878 later became loyal citizens.<sup>22</sup> Nevertheless, in the first years after the Berlin Congress, the resentment of Muslims towards Austrians was noticeable.<sup>23</sup> However, distrust and resentment were not the most important factors. A much more important factor that rendered it impossible for the Austrians to take advantage of the local Muslim elites was their educational profile. Well, the competence of the *Kadi, hodja* and other representatives of the “elite of Muslim Bosniak society” who were educated in the Islamic educational system was by and large useless to the Austrian authorities. The knowledge of the Quran, and consequently of the law based on it, and the ability to read in oriental languages, were not enough for the authorities in Vienna to entrust such a person with the responsibility of creating a modern administration. For the Emperor, an official suitable for this task had to have a university education, preferably a degree in law, a command of German and had to navigate effortlessly through the meanders of the Josephinian Code.<sup>24</sup> However, in order not to deprive the country’s existing Muslim elite of income and thus of their position (which was already severely damaged), it was decided to leave in place some institutions from the Ottoman era, e.g. particularly the system of Sharia courts for Muslims, or religious schools, and to establish new institutions such as the *Zemaljska vakufska komisija*, which was to take care of schools, shelters and other entities dedicated to the Muslim community from 1883 onwards.<sup>25</sup> On the one hand, there was a desire to show Muslims that their rights were respected, (as Vienna was obligated to do by international agree-

<sup>20</sup> Younis, *Biti kadija u kršćanskom carstvu*, pp. 49–50.

<sup>21</sup> Rizvić, *Bosansko-Muslimanska književnost u doba preporoda 1887–1918*, pp. 40–41; Cf. Džanko, *Mehmed beg Kapetanović Ljubušak*, pp. 16–18.

<sup>22</sup> Kamberović, *Begovski zemljišni posjedi u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1878. Do 1918. Godine*, p. 390.

<sup>23</sup> In 1882, a revolt of the Muslim population, supported by the Serbs, broke out as a result of the first military draft, but this was soon bloodily suppressed. Kapidžić, *Hercegovački ustanak*, p. 217; Sugar, *Industrialization of Bosnia and Hercegovina 1878–1818*, pp. 33–35.

<sup>24</sup> Here I refer to a set of rules that were associated with performing the duties of a civil servant in Austria-Hungary. Tomasz Jacek Lis, *Polscy urzędnicy wyższego szczebla w Bośni i Hercegowinie w latach 1878-1918*, p., 285; Cf. Megner, *Beamte. Wirtschafts- und sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte des k. k. Beamtenums*, pp. 19–30.

<sup>25</sup> *Zemaljsko Vakufsko Povjerenstvo za Bosnu i Hercegovinu (1890. – 1895.). Analitički inventar*, VI.

ments<sup>26</sup>); on the other hand, they were allowed to function within their own legal traditions and culture, but only within such limits as did not prevent Vienna from pursuing its policies. When there was a conflict of interest, as a rule, the interests of Austria proved more important than the rights or traditions of Muslims.<sup>27</sup>

In view of the above, the emperor used the well-known model of action from the past, which was to bring a cadre of officials from the neighbouring crown countries.<sup>28</sup> The professionalization of the civil service profession accelerated since Benjamin von Kállay (1882–1903) helmed the Joint Ministry of Finance, as he tackled the reform of the civil administration, making working in Bosnia and Herzegovina attractive especially to young civil officials.<sup>29</sup> Among them were plenty of people from neighbouring Croatian Banovina or Dalmatia who were looking for work opportunities in the neighbouring country. To the bulk of them, what mattered was probably the decent salary offered by the National Government; however, to some, the trip to Bosnia and Herzegovina was dictated by a sense of national mission. Often this case was connected with teachers educating Muslim girls, e.g. Ela Kranjčević.<sup>30</sup>

### The historic mission

As already mentioned, Croatian elites regarded Bosnia and Herzegovina as a country that should become a Croatian land in the near or distant future. In 1908 Stjepan Radić published the book entitled *Živio hrvatsko pravo na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, in which he wrote that in the Middle Ages Bosnia was part of the Kingdom of Croatia, and now it should be merged with them.<sup>31</sup> Ivo Pilar, in turn, wrote that the medieval Bogomils, who were later supposed to convert to Islam, were ethnic Croats, referring to them as Bosnian-Croat Croats.<sup>32</sup> After the annexation of

<sup>26</sup> During the Berlin congress as well as, most importantly, in the New Pazar convention of 1879, the emperor pledged to look after the interests of Muslims. Čaušević, *Pravno-politički razvitak Bosne i Hercegovine. Dokumenti sa komentarima*, pp. 198–199.

<sup>27</sup> If an institution like the commercial courts established during the Ottoman period interfered with the westernization of Bosnia and Herzegovina they were abolished. Kasumović, *Austrougarska trgovinska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini 1878–1914*, pp. 44–46.

<sup>28</sup> The Austrian authorities followed a similar model in the late 18th century when they received part of the Republic. Czech, Austrian and Hungarian officials were attracted to the areas of the then-created new province of the Kingdom of Galicia and Lodomeria to form the country's civil administration, as the existing Polish elites were unsuitable. Cf.

<sup>29</sup> It was on his initiative that new pension regulations for civil servants were created, as well as a loan fund. *Glasnik zakona i naredaba za Bosnu i Hercegovinu of 1885*, Sarajevo 1886, Pension Provision No. 177 of 5 December 1885, No. 23930/II; GZNBiH of 1886, Sarajevo 1886, Extract No. 11 of 8 May 1886, No. 21315/I; cf. Ferdinand Schmid, *Bosnien und die Herzegovina unter der Verwaltung Oesterreich-Ungarns*, 61–62

<sup>30</sup> In letters from Ela to Anton Kranjčević, she wrote about her progress in teaching Muslim girls. Archives of the Croatian Academy of Science in Zagreb, Manuscripts, Silvije Strahmir Kranjčević, Letters of Ela Kranjčević to Anton Kranjčević, Sarajevo 19 February 1910, sign. HR HAZU/167-21/629. Similar point of view presented Jagoda Truhelka.

<sup>31</sup> Radić, *Živio hrvatsko pravo na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, pp. 28–30.

<sup>32</sup> Zgodić, *Ideja Bosanske nacije*, pp. 97–98.

Bosnia, plenty of Croats said that now is the time to connect these two countries. That is why there was a great disappointment in Croatia when Franz Joseph II did not agree with this idea.<sup>33</sup> However, it is worth bearing in mind that this was more about uniting it within the framework of the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, rather than breaking away and creating a separate independent state. Admittedly, among the *Pravaši*, such a vision was certainly attractive, but nevertheless the political and international circumstances of the time did not allow in any way to even dream of such solutions. Looking for the possibility of uniting Banovina with Bosnia and Herzegovina within the borders of the Habsburg monarchy, from the point of view of the Austrian emperor was not very threatening. What mattered to him was that Bosnia and Herzegovina would sooner or later be permanently united with the rest of his dualistic empire. Paradoxically, however, the road to this led through the activities of Croats, whose role in this process was crucial. This happened for several reasons. Firstly, Croats, at least since 1848, were regarded as one of the most loyal nations to the emperor. Admittedly, there were voices about the need for a less servile policy toward Vienna (*Pravaši*)<sup>34</sup> or closer “brotherly” ties with other Slavic nations, popular in the early 20th century. (the Illyrian idea), they were nevertheless considered a nation loyal to the Habsburgs. Secondly, the Austrian authorities themselves also saw, especially at the end of the 1890s, that closer cooperation with the Croatian elite was a necessity, since it would be impossible to govern the country stably with their own forces, which consisted primarily, in addition to the army, of a host of administrations drawn from everywhere. Even Kállay, who comes across as a person averse to the Slavs, was aware of this.

The joint Finance Minister had many ideas about how to conduct politics in the country. On the one hand, he wanted to stimulate the development of a national identity among Muslims in a way that they would be more oriented toward the monarchy than toward the Croatian or especially Serbian national ideas.<sup>35</sup> On the other hand, he sought to create a community in Bosnia and Herzegovina that, despite its multi-religious and multi-cultural nature, would consider the country its homeland.<sup>36</sup> The existing literature, especially from Yugoslavia, indicated that Kállay’s activities, and consequently those of the monarchy, went to create a Bosnian nation loyal to Austria-Hungary and therefore the national activities of Croats and Serbs were fought against. This was more or less the characterization of the rule of the Hungarian Finance Minister in 1987 by Tomislav Kraljačić. In his monumental work on Kállay he wrote the following about him: *Kállay’s national policy, apart from its apparent inconsistency, ran along the line of preserving and building the national-political uniqueness of Bosnia and Herzegovina and crea-*

<sup>33</sup> Grlović, *Dnevnik*, pp. 230–231.

<sup>34</sup> The Croat name of a right-wing political group.

<sup>35</sup> More on the idea of „Bosnianism“; Okey, *Taming Balkan Nationalism. The Habsburg „Civilizing Mission” in Bosnia, 1878–1914*, pp. 92–98; Hajdarpasic, *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914*, p. 176; Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni I Hercegovini*, 215–229.

<sup>36</sup> Feldman, Kállay’s dilemma on the challenge of creating a manageable identity in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1882–1903), pp. 109–114.



ting conditions for Bosnia and Herzegovina to become immune to Serb and Croat national-political influences.<sup>37</sup>

In light of modern research, some corrections should be made to this opinion. Well, Kállay used solutions that were characteristic of Hungarian politicians balancing between different nationalities in the country, i.e., strengthening the weaker nation against the stronger one. As in Banovina, Károly Khuen-Héderváry supported the Serbian financiers against the Croats<sup>38</sup>, so in Bosnia, Kállay gave more opportunities for Croats to act against Serbs. Especially since some of them, e.g. the Bosnian Franciscan leader Antun Knežević, preached slogans that coincided with the minister's claims. In his high-profile work on Bosnian kings in the Middle Ages, he pushed the thesis of a single Bosnian nation, whose closest ties were with Croats, in the past.<sup>39</sup> Naturally, one can find a number of arguments seemingly contradicting this thesis, after all, there is no shortage of cases when the authorities prohibited Croatians from national activities, such as prohibiting the awarding of decorations referring to Croatian history<sup>40</sup> or hindering the functioning of certain societies,<sup>41</sup> and even restricting the activities of church representatives.<sup>42</sup> Each of these incidents, however, had a specific reason for their decision. Decisions denying or forbidding something to Croats, however, did not bear the hallmarks of a systemic action aimed at harming Croat interests in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The most common reason for the authorities appearing to counter the Croats was the desire to maintain a relative balance in society, so that no one would directly accuse the authorities in Sarajevo of favouring any of the national groups living in the country. In this regard, the officials who had direct contact with the local population in the first place were very sensitive, and they had to treat, despite their sympathies and antipathies, representatives of all nations and religions in the same way.<sup>43</sup>

The relationship of the Austrian occupation authorities to the Croats and the Croats to Austria within Bosnia and Herzegovina between 1878 and 1914 is an example of a "marriage of convenience," where the two sides did not feel undue affection for each other, but in view of the existing circumstances decided that it would be better for their interests (which were not always shared) to go together rather than separately. For Vienna, it was advantageous for the Croats to dominate in education or strengthen the influence of the Church. They even acquiesced to their

<sup>37</sup> Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini*, p. 525.

<sup>38</sup> Cf. Rumenjak, *Politička karikatura i slika „Khuenovih Srba” s kraja 19. st. u. Hrvatskoj*, pp. 473–486; Biondich, *Stjepan Radic, the Croat Peasant Party, and the Politics of Mass Mobilization, 1904–1928*, p. 18.

<sup>39</sup> Knežević, *Kratka povijest Kralja Bosanskih*, p. 10.

<sup>40</sup> Arhiv Republike Srpske [dalej ARSBL], Kreisbehörde Banja Luka, 1893/45/20.

<sup>41</sup> Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 158–159; Pejanović, *Kulturno-prosvjetna humana i socijalna društva u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme austrougarske vladavine*, pp. 24–25.

<sup>42</sup> Cases when the authorities interfered with the Church's activities were not common; however, they did occur when there was a danger that too zealous evangelism could provoke protests from other denominations.

<sup>43</sup> Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu, Zemaljska Vlada Sarajevo [dalej ABH, ZVS] 1907, sygn. 5/10.

national propaganda (*Pravaši* or even *Frankovci*) as long as it was not too pushy and not too controversial, as exemplified by the functioning of Croatian reading rooms or institutions such as *Napredak*.<sup>44</sup> This is a rare case where the empire exploited the internal tensions of national movements for its own ends, not fighting them, but supporting them. Austrian superiors were not even offended by the involvement of their subordinates in the propagation of the Croatian national idea, although officially officials had to be impartial.<sup>45</sup> Even the fact of the attraction of some Muslim elites towards Croatian culture was not a very big problem for them – it was even treated as something positive at times<sup>46</sup>. They acquiesced to all this as long as the Croats constituted an effective barrier against the spread of Serbian influence. Of course, such benevolence toward Croats was not the same throughout the occupation. There were periods where Croatian nationalism was more of a hindrance, such as during the time of General Filipović, or in the 1880s, but also periods when institutions directly referring to the Croatian national idea were bluntly allowed to be established (late 19th and early 20th centuries). Everything depended on the current situation, since it was not Croats who posed the biggest problem for the authorities, but the Orthodox. Orthodox adherents were considered the biggest threat both because of the policies of the Kingdom of Serbia and Russian interests. When we look at archival documents, we notice that spy reports or police reports mostly concerned the Orthodox – their contacts with Belgrade, Russian influence, or national propaganda.<sup>47</sup> It is difficult to find a case that a book published in Zagreb could not be distributed in Bosnia and Herzegovina, while such bans, in the case of Serbian books, were plentiful.<sup>48</sup> Even arrests of clergymen, e.g. that of *pop* Stevo Trifković, who was arrested for selling the *Rad* calendar imported from Serbia in 1901, were not feared. At the time, this Orthodox clergyman explained that Croats sell their magazines in churches and no one makes problems for them, while he was imprisoned for it.<sup>49</sup> If there were already cases of spying on Croats, it was because they had ties to Yugoslav activities because no one persecuted anyone for favouring the Croatian national movement. At worst, the authorities only restricted excessive activity in this regard. In short, the authorities' "repression" of Croats was due to something quite different from their "repression" of Serbs. The Austrians in Bosnia only allowed Croat national aspirations when they became excessively oppressive and could cause discontent such as the confession

<sup>44</sup> "*Napredak*" was founded in Sarajevo in 1902, and in 1904 merged with another organization dedicated to helping Croatian youths studying in secondary schools. Its first president was Anto Palandžić. A year later, the society already had more than 1,000 members and its clubs in other major cities in the country. Starting in 1907, it published its periodical *Napredak-Kalendar* and soon became the strongest Croatian institution in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Blažanović, „*Napredak*” u Zagrebu. *Prilozi za monografiju*, pp., 9–10.

<sup>45</sup> ABH, ZVS 1907, ref. 5/10.

<sup>46</sup> Arhiv Bošnjačkog Instituta im. Zulfikarpašića u Sarajevu, sygn. 1/IV/15/6, s. 3.

<sup>47</sup> ARSBL, Kreisbehörde 1881, sygn. 11/3; ARSBL Kreisbehörde 1881, sygn. 15/10; ARSBL Kreisbehörde 1895, sygn. 11/35.

<sup>48</sup> n 1894, authorities banned the distribution of Maksim Šobajić's book, „*Osveta kosowska. Junačke pjesme srpske*”; ARSBL, Kreisbehörde 1894, ref. 51/21. And in 1914, in turn, the work of Veljike Petrović, „*Rodoljubne pjesme*”, ARSBL, Kreisbehörde 1914, ref. 516/21.

<sup>49</sup> ABH, ZVS 1901, ref. m3/58.

of Muslims to Catholicism, which was favoured by the Sarajevo Archbishop Josip Stadler.<sup>50</sup> However, they posed no threat to Habsburg state interests. In contrast, the national activities of the Serbs, especially after 1903 in Vienna's view, were anti-Habsburg in nature and sought to separate Bosnia and Herzegovina from Austria-Hungary.

If we attempt to look at the problem in this way, we should not be surprised that the authorities were particularly sympathetic to many Croatian initiatives. It should be emphasized, however, that this was done not because of Austrian sympathies towards the Croats, but pure pragmatism. Austria-Hungary had neither the financial nor the human resources to subjugate Bosnia and Herzegovina in such a way as to control all spheres of life, e.g. education, culture, etc. Therefore, not wanting it to fall into the hands of the Serbs, who were considered the greatest threat to their influence in the country, the Croats were allowed to operate, but within such limits as were "safe" from the point of view of Vienna's interests.

Of course, the emancipation of Muslims was also supported, but it was realized that they were not a strong enough group to oppose Serbian influence. In addition, the new authorities, especially in the provinces, were met with great distrust, so the National Government made efforts to win over the *begs*, including singling them out as a privileged group so that their votes would have great significance in elections to the *Sabor*.<sup>51</sup> In fact, only Muslims from large urban centres, primarily Sarajevo, responded to the offer of cooperation with the Austrians.<sup>52</sup>

However, this was not nearly enough. Croatian intellectual elites on the other hand, saw this as an opportunity to realize their national aspirations formulated years ago by Ante Starčević and Eugen Kvaternik.<sup>53</sup> Moreover, while in Croatian Banovina the Kluen-Heredvay regime was step by step reducing the privileges of *nagodba*, in Bosnia and Herzegovina the most important institutions were full of Croats' intelligences. Despite being among the decision-makers; heads of various departments, or high-ranking officials, Croat elites appeared quite rarely. They had a great influence especially on education or culture, besides the fact that they were lower in the official hierarchy allowed them to have more frequent contact with the local population, and thus more effective national propaganda. It is no coincidence that individuals from the realm of Croatian culture and science, e.g. Ćiro and Jagoda Truhelka or the German Kösta Hormann, made outstanding careers in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Among them should also be mentioned one of the most prominent writers of his generation Silvije Strahimir Kranjčević, who was the editor of one of the leading pro-government periodicals *Nada*, where eminent Croatian scholars such as Ferdo Šišić<sup>54</sup> and Ksavier Šandor Gjalski<sup>55</sup> published their texts.

---

<sup>50</sup> Grijak, *Politička djelatnost vrhbosanskog nadbiskupa Josipa Stadlera*, 251–253; Dokument 10, in: *Borba muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine za vjersku i vakufsko-mearifsku autonomiju*, p. 89.

<sup>51</sup> Kamberović, *Begovski zemljišni posjedi*, pp. 82–83.

<sup>52</sup> Donia, *Islam pod dvoglavim orlom: Muslimani Bosne i Hercegovine 1878.–1914*, p. 49.

<sup>53</sup> Czerwiński, *Chorwacja. Dzieje, kultura, idee*, p. 394.

<sup>54</sup> Šišić, Mehmed II Fatih, „Nada”, No. 9, (1 May 1896), p. 171.

<sup>55</sup> Gjalski, Beg za Sutle, „Nada”, No. 6, (15 March 1896), p. 101.

## Croats in educational and cultural institutions

Thanks to the favourable attitude of the occupation authorities, Croats were able to develop their institutions and pursue their national goals, which included, above all, the propagation of culture and also the formation of youth. However, this was not the case from the very beginning, for although accusations of the Croatisation of education were made as early as the early 1880s,<sup>56</sup> it was only in the second decade of Austrian rule in Bosnia and Herzegovina that Croats were allowed to develop their national activities to a greater extent, i.e. institutions like the Church, and also education, scientific or cultural societies. While the role of the Church does not require much commentary, since there is no shortage of studies on both the activities of the Franciscans and the most important men representing the secular clergy.<sup>57</sup> The issue of education or scientific and cultural associations should be mentioned a little more extensively, especially since a number of myths have arisen around these institutions. One of them is the opinion that Croatian education was the sole responsibility of the clergy.<sup>58</sup> Of course, the role of the clergy, both secular and religious, cannot be overlooked, but it is also necessary to point out the activity of the Croatian intelligentsia in state education in Bosnia and Herzegovina. For the most part, this was an immigrant group. In the absence of a native Croatian intelligentsia, limited during the Ottoman period mainly to the Franciscans, as mentioned earlier, the Croatisation of education or scientific and cultural societies was carried out through secular intelligentsia arriving from Dalmatia or the Tri-unity Kingdom. One of the most important people in charge of education was Ljuboje Dlustuš, under whose authority state education became one of the main tools for implementing the Croatian national policy.<sup>59</sup>

Of course, in the older historiography, we can encounter the opinion that the school pursued only the pro-Habsburg propaganda, which was equally directed against Serbs and Croats. One such example is supposed to be the dispute over the name of the state language, which was changed several times to avoid being called Croatian<sup>60</sup>. However, this decision was dictated solely by practical considerations – referring to the language used in Bosnia and Herzegovina as Croatian was a clear violation of the slogans of equality for all nations. Therefore, both *Glas Hercegovca*, the long-standing press organ of Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the musical societies, were not allowed to use the term “Croatian,” nor to

---

<sup>56</sup> Okey, *Taming Balkan Nationalism*, pp. 51–52.

<sup>57</sup> Gavranović, *Uspostava redovite katoličke hijerarhije u Bosni i Hercegovini 1881. Godine.*; Karamatić, *Franjevci Bosne Srebrene u vrijeme austrougarske uprave 1878–1914.*; Blažević, *Bosanski franjevci i nadbiskup dr. Josip Stadler.*; [Anonimus] *Nadbiskup Stadler i Franjevci razbistrilo Prosperus Dalmata.*

<sup>58</sup> Papić, *Hrvatsko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918 godine*, p. 151.

<sup>59</sup> Its role in raising the educational level of Croatian youth had already been recognized by historians. Peco, *Osnovno školstvo u Hercegovini. Za vrijeme austrougarske vlasti 1878–1918*, p. 47.

<sup>60</sup> Papić, *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme Austrougarske okupacije (1878–1918)*, pp. 10–14; Kruševac, *Sarajevo pod austro-ugarskom upravom 1878–1918*, pp. 398–400.

directly refer to historical Croatian heroes.<sup>61</sup> However, this decision had very practical reasons – they did not want a vision of history other than the Habsburg one to be propagated in the public sphere. Therefore, to consistently forbid all naming referring to national history and tradition. However, toward the end of Benjamin von Kállay's reign, this was gradually abandoned, eventually breaking with this type of policy for the nations living in Bosnia and Herzegovina during the reign of his successors.

However, let us return to education, since it was in Bosnia and Herzegovina of the early 20<sup>th</sup> century “based on Croats”. We can see this by reviewing the statistics. Before we get to them, a brief clarification that is hinted at in the introduction must be made. Namely, in government statistics, as was the case in other parts of Austria-Hungary, nationality was not asked, but religion. Therefore, the following statistics refer not directly to Croats, but to Catholics. At the same time, it should be borne in mind that at that time in Bosnia and Herzegovina most Catholics considered themselves Croats, and even the influx of people who were referred to as *kuferaši* did not change this.<sup>62</sup>

Among the three major religions the Catholics were the weakest in numbers. In 1900, Catholics in Bosnia and Herzegovina numbered 22.9% or 434,061 people, Muslims 32.3% or 612,137 people, while the largest number was represented by Orthodox Christians, totalling almost 43.5% or 825,418 people. At the same time, in state-run elementary schools the number of children attending lessons in 1902–1909 looked like this:

*Number of children attending state elementary schools in 1902–1909 by religion*<sup>63</sup>

Year	Orthodox	Catholics	Muslims	Jews	Total
1902/3	8,608	9,236	4,026	955	23,158
1903/4	8,608	9,759	4,302	953	23,971
1904/5	8,503	10,011	4,454	910	24,236
1905/6	8,300	10,334	4,890	881	24,786
1906/7	8,700	10,508	4,937	899	25,845
1907/8	8,139	11,271	5,125	944	25,455
1908/9	8,575	12,104	5,564	903	27,549

<sup>61</sup> Gross, *Hrvatska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini*, p. 18; Grijak, *Benjamin Kallay i vrhbosanski nadbiskup Josip Stadler. Problemi katolicizma u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 108–113.

<sup>62</sup> The term *kuferaši* was used in the context of people who came from different parts of the monarchy to Bosnia and Herzegovina. They were not a numerically dominant group in the state, but due to their high functions their position in the country was very strong. Due to their linguistic affinity, they were mostly Slavs; Poles, Czechs, Moravians, Slovaks; Benthke, *Einwanderung und Kolonisten im k.u.k. Bosnien-Herzegowina - Überblick mit 'bosniakischen' Perspektiven*, pp. 239–241; Omerović, „‘Odlazak kuferaša’”. *Iseljavanje stranaca iz Bosne i Hercegovine neposrednk nakon Prvog svjetskog rata*“, pp. 69–122.

<sup>63</sup> *Podaci za proučavanje prosvjetnog rada u Bosni i Hercegovini: referat za „Prosvjetinu“ anketu*, p. 9.

As can be seen, the majority of children attending state elementary schools between 1902 and 1909 were Catholics – initially less than 40% while in the 1908/9 school year it was more than 43%. Although Catholics were the smallest religious group in the country, they had the largest representation in state schools. They also had a slightly smaller, but still strong, presence in secondary schools.

*Percentage of students in secondary schools in Bosnia and Herzegovina by religion*<sup>64</sup>

Middle School	Orthodox	Catholics	Muslims
I Sarajevo (1880–1910)	40%	35%	13%
Banja Luka (1895–1910)	45%	35%	12%
Mostar (1894–1909)	39%	35%	19%
Tuzla (1899–1909)	45%	34%	15%
II Sarajevo (1905–1910)	21%	49%	14%

While elementary school was attended by children of both sexes, secondary schools were mainly for boys. Admittedly, there were cases when a girl was enrolled in a class, e.g. in the case of the First Gymnasium in Sarajevo, where in the school year 1910/1911, in a class with Ivo Andrić, the future Nobel laureate, Maria Woska, daughter of the Czech-born teacher Jan Woska, attended.<sup>65</sup> However instances such as this one were rare exceptions. If one wanted to educate girls in secondary schools, they went to private institutions or state schools for female teachers. Taking a look at the statistics in question, we see a significant advantage of Catholic women over the rest of the confession. This was mainly due to the fact that the Orthodox in the early 20<sup>th</sup> century had only one such private school at the secondary level. Catholics, on the other hand, had six and Muslims not a single one. Admittedly, it happened that Orthodox girls attended Catholic schools, but these were exceptions. In the case of Muslim women, on the other hand, I was able to identify only one such situation. In the St. Joseph's Catholic School, which was run by nuns in Sarajevo, in the 1915/16 school year a Muslim girl born in 1903, i.e. Adila Tatarović from Srebrenica, was enrolled.<sup>66</sup> Therefore, at the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the statistics of female students in secondary schools were as follows.

<sup>64</sup> Podaci za proučavanje prosvjetnog rada, p. 31–33.

<sup>65</sup> HAS, Imenik učenika Velike Gimnazije Sarajevo, za 1910/1911, Maria Woska [missing signature].

<sup>66</sup> HAS, Privatna Ženska Škola im. Sv. Josipa, Katalog imena, Razrednica 1915/16, Ref. ŽSŠJ-114

*Number of female students by religion in private secondary schools in 1902–1905.*<sup>67</sup>

School	School year	Orthodox	Catholic	Jew	Other	Total
Private Orthodox Sschool in Sarajevo	1902/3	63				63
	1903/4	62				62
	1904/5	73				73
St. Joseph's Pprivate Catholic Sschool in Sarajevo	1902/3		47	1		48
	1903/4	3	54	1		58
	1904/5		67			67
Private Sschool of the Sisters of Mercy in Sarajevo	1902/3	1	91	1		93
	1903/4	2	97	4		103
	1904/5	1	86	2		89
Sisters of Mercy private school in Travnik	1902/3	3	14	7		24
	1903/4	2	17	5		24
	1904/5	2	20	5		27
Private School of the Sisters of the Precious Blood in Bihać	1902/3	5	22	1		28
	1903/4	4	20	1	1	26
	1904/5	6	25	1		32
St. Augustine Sisters' Private School (with German) in Sarajevo	1902/3		104	25	5	134
	1903/4		115	17	4	136
	1904/5		106	22	6	133
St. Augustine Sisters' Private School (with German) in Sarajevo Lower Tuzla	1902/3		26	6	2	34
	1903/4		24	8		32
	1904/5	1	33	12		46

We will notice a slightly smaller advantage of Catholic girls over girls of other religions when we analyze the statistics of schools for female teachers, maintained by the state.

*Female students according to religion in state schools for female teachers in 1900–1905.*<sup>68</sup>

Year	Muslim	Orthodox	Catholic	Jew	Other
1900/01	38	37	41		2
1901/02	41	27	41		1
1902/03	28	31	39	1	
1903/04	28	40	45	1	
1904/05	21	33	39	1	

State schooling was dominated not only by Catholic male and female students, but, perhaps even more significantly, by teachers. At the beginning of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, the number of teachers was increasing, but Catholics were the only religion that successively increased in number year after year. In terms of percentage, in

<sup>67</sup> *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Herzegovina - Ausgabe .1906*, p. 188.

<sup>68</sup> *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina - Ausgabe .1906*, p. 191.

the 1904/05 school year less than 43% were Catholics, while 5 years later the percentage of the total population of teachers in state schools was already 46.5%. In comparison, the share of Orthodox Christians declined from 41% in the 1904/05 school year to less than 35% in the 1909/10 school year.

*The number of teachers in state schools from 1904 to 1910 according to religion*<sup>69</sup>

Year	Orthodox	Muslim	Catholic	Jew	Other	Total
1904/05	233	96	244	1	4	568
1905/06	224	101	254	-	6	585
1906/07	223	109	263	-	4	599
1907/08	228	111	279	-	4	622
1908/09	226	111	306	3	2	648
1909/10	244	107	311	2	4	668

The predominance of Catholics and, consequently, Croats, can be seen not only in the school statistics of students and teachers. If we analyze the teachers' main press organ in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Školski Vjesnik*, published since 1894, we also see that it was one of the tools in the hands of Croatian educators. The main editor of the magazine was the aforementioned Ljuboje Dlustuš. Owing to the fact that it was financed by the National Government, this periodical could not post overtly pro-Croatian content. Nevertheless, analyzing the subsequent issues of *Vjesnik*, one can observe that there is more content related to Croatia and education there than to any other country. For instance, the *Pedagoška smotra* section included information on schools from Austria, Hungary, Croatia and only then from other countries.<sup>70</sup> Furthermore, a large proportion of those who posted articles there came from the Croatian intellectual circles. The predominance of Croats in education was also noted by some teachers themselves. In her memoirs, Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska, a teacher at girls' colleges in Sarajevo, Mostar, and Banja Luka, wrote bitterly about the situation in Bosnian-Herzegovinian education: *Since they can gain fame and honour through the "Franco-volves" Bosnia is today at their mercy. Poor Bosnia! I know the souls of these people! Teachers here are the promoters of "Franko profiteering" so they get higher salaries and "ranks".<sup>72</sup> That is why Dlustuš frowned, because it concerns him. With this he covered his stains of moral mud!*<sup>73</sup> Jelica's opinions should be treated with great distance, as she was very biased in her judgments; nevertheless, the strong influence of Croatian national ideas among teachers and educators cannot be denied. Ademaga Mesić, a Muslim and one of the leading supporters of Ante Starčević's ideas, in his memoirs

<sup>69</sup> Podaci za proučavanje prosvjetnog rada, p. 29.

<sup>70</sup> Sadržaj, „Školski Vjesnik”, Vol. 2 (1895), p. V.

<sup>71</sup> Fans of the Josip Frank and their party, „Čista stranka prava”.

<sup>72</sup> Officials in the Austro-Hungarian administration were divided into ranks. Promotion meant receiving a higher rank, which meant greater prestige and higher pay.

<sup>73</sup> Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska, *Memoari Jelice Belović-Bernadzikowske [Ljube T. Dančić]*, p. 439.



repeatedly cites examples of teachers from Tešanj who promoted the Croatian national idea at school, which influenced young Muslims such as Ivica Hećimović.<sup>74</sup> Of course, among the Serbs there was also a group of teachers who were radical national activists;<sup>75</sup> however, they were limited to the so-called “confessional” schools, i.e. run by Serbs for Serbs. Moreover, their activities, unlike those of the Croats, were much more controlled by the state. This control was exercised not only over teachers, but also officials or representatives of the intellectual elite in general. A good example of the Austrian authorities’ double standards is the attitude of the security services towards Croatian and Serbian associations and societies.

From the mid 1890s, various societies and associations began to appear in the country to stimulate cultural and social development in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The resulting organizations excelled as venues for national propaganda. The authorities were aware that under the guise of operating a reading room or musical society, political agitation could be carried out, which meant that the activities of societies run by Orthodox Christians were particularly closely monitored. Primarily, this was a matter of investigating whether they had ties to Belgrade, both personal and financial. Membership in certain Serbian organizations, e.g. Sokol, automatically caused the police in Bosnia and Herzegovina to take an interest in a person.<sup>76</sup> The same, by the way, was true of the Prosvjeta organization, which was, inter alia, in charge of providing scholarships for the Orthodox youth. Not coincidentally, in 1903 the local authorities in Banja Luka demanded to know which students of the girls’ high school were benefiting from Prosvjeta’s support.<sup>77</sup> Despite these restrictions, it was the Serbian societies that were the most numerous, and they could not refer in their name to either Serbianism or Orthodoxy,<sup>78</sup> because, as mentioned above, any, even theoretical, connection with foreign powers was grounds for closure of the organization in question.

The authorities, including Benjamin von Kállay, took a somewhat different approach to societies founded by Croats. Even Kraljačić, who was generally highly critical of him, admitted that Croatian initiatives to establish societies, ensembles, or reading rooms were treated far more leniently.<sup>79</sup> Although the overt reference to Croatian history in naming was unacceptable,<sup>80</sup> no one was bothered by the connections of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian organizations with Zagreb, or Croats living in Bosnia and Herzegovina with societies or reading rooms in Croatian Bannovina. In the materials of Mije Matasović (Josip’s father<sup>81</sup>) we find his numerous

<sup>74</sup> National and University Library in Zagreb, Manuscript Collection, Adamage Mesić, Memoare Vol.1, p. 68; Adamage Mesić, Memoare Vol. 2, p. 51, sign. R. 6626.

<sup>75</sup> Džaja, *Bosna i Hercegovina u austrougarskom razdoblju*, pp. 110–111.

<sup>76</sup> ARSBL, Kreisbehörde, 1914, 546/26.

<sup>77</sup> ARSBL, Kreisbehörde, 1903, 52/23.

<sup>78</sup> Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 153–154.

<sup>79</sup> Kraljačić, *Kalajev režim u Bosni i Hercegovini*, pp. 160–161.

<sup>80</sup> Kevro, *Nazivi jezika u službenim dokumentima za vrijeme austrougarske vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini*, p. 87.

<sup>81</sup> Josip Matasović was a historian and archivist. For over a decade (1941–1958), he held the position of the director at the Croatian State Archives. He was a pioneer in researching the

correspondence from the period when he worked as an official in Foča, among other places, so we are able to trace his activities, including those outside of office. Matasović Sr. held important positions, including the office of district governor. Sitting in such important positions was in no way incompatible with his commitment to Croatian associations and organizations. Here are some examples; In 1909, the Croatian Reading Room in Kupreš asked him for assistance, as it needed finances to renovate the reading room in its newly purchased building.<sup>82</sup> On another occasion, the leader of the Bosnian Croats, Nikola Mandić, asked him, in the interests of our (i.e. Croatian) nation, to help with the land reclamation of Kiseljak.<sup>83</sup> Whether and to what extent Matasović helped is unknown, but certainly his position on the official ladder proved useful to the Croatian cause. This is known, among other things, from the thanks he received from the Croatian national community *for his work on behalf of the homeland*.<sup>84</sup> He was also a regular guest at events organized by Napredak.<sup>85</sup> At the same time, it is hard to imagine that a Serbian official of the same level as Mije Matasović could have counted on similar forbearance from the authorities for his commitment to Serbian scientific or cultural institutions. Societies and associations, although not as influential as education, played a significant role as well. The authorities regarded the Croatian propaganda spread through them as the “lesser evil,” and their activities or the involvement of the clerical corps were accepted, although the latter, in principle, should remain impartial.

Of course, not all officials were as deeply involved as Matasović; however, even if only some supported the Croatian national movement, this would already be a significant number. All this is due to the dominance of Croat officials in the civil administration of Bosnia and Herzegovina. As was the case with teachers, Croats had a significant overrepresentation among officials as well. Between 1906 and 1911, the group of people in the clerical corps declaring their nationality as Croatian accounted for about 25% of all officials.<sup>86</sup> They, along with teachers, formed the basis of the Croatian intelligentsia in Bosnia and Herzegovina, who – thanks to the opportunity to work in the country – were free to work for the development of the Croatian national movement.

---

history of culture in interwar Yugoslavia. Muras, „Josip Matasović u svijetlu hrvatske etnologie”, pp. 11–34.

<sup>82</sup> Hrvatski Državni Arhiv [HDA], Obiteljski Fond Josipa Matasovića (1059), kut. 165, Mije Matasović, Kupreš 29 July 1909.

<sup>83</sup> HDA, OFJM (1059), kut. 165, Mije Matasović, Sarajevo 27 January 1912.

<sup>84</sup> HDA, OFJM, (1059), kut. 165, Mije Matasović, [unspecified location], 06 November 1913.

<sup>85</sup> HDA, OFJM, (1059), kut. 165, Mije Matasović, Busovac, 03 September 1910.

<sup>86</sup> Unfortunately, subsequent government statistics no longer provide the data on nationality, but ancestry. However, in the case of Croats, it is given as Serbo-Croatian. *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina 1914–1916*, p. 178.

*Number of Croatian officials between 1906 and 1914*<sup>87</sup>

Year	Number	% in the entire official corps
1906	2,437	27..03
1907	2,468	26..37
1908	2,368	24..84
1909	2,346	24..10
1910	2,585	23..62
1911	2,671	23..49

**Attitude towards Muslims**

By means of schooling Croats had a major impact on the society in Bosnia and Herzegovina, which also influenced other nations, primarily Muslims. Secondary school students had much greater access to national content promoting Croatian national ideas than their Serbian counterparts. Materials issued by the Matica hrvatska, the central Croatian national organization, reached young people through teachers and officials, who thus embraced the national content.<sup>88</sup> Consequently, both the older generation of Muslims (Mehmed bej-Kapetanović Ljubušak) and, particularly, the younger generation (Safet bej-Bašagić, Osman Nuri Haržić, etc.) had access to Croatian culture, regarding it as attractive because it provided an alternative to the Habsburg propaganda imposed by the state. However, this did not mean that they all felt Croatian. The question of national sentiment among the Muslims of Bosnia and Herzegovina, however, is much more difficult to characterize than is the case with other multicultural societies in the Austro-Hungarian monarchy, e.g. Bohemia, where the element of Czechness and Germanness coexisted.<sup>89</sup> The situation for Bosnian Muslims was different; for a long time the question of nationality did not exist there. Among other reasons, Bosnian Muslims were not interested in the Illyrian movement, which came into existence in their country only thanks to the Franciscans.<sup>90</sup> Some leaders of the followers of Islam in Bosnia and Herzegovina, e.g. Ali Paša-Rizvanbegović, had the consciousness of belonging to the Slavic world,<sup>91</sup> but it was far from any national declaration yet. For the generation born and raised in the Ottoman Empire, religion was an important element of identity, but so was their place of origin. Bosnian Muslims felt they were

<sup>87</sup> Author's own calculations based on *Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina for 1906–1911*.

<sup>88</sup> Rizvić, *Bosansko-Muslimanska književnost u doba preporoda*, p. 107.

<sup>89</sup> Zahra, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948*.

<sup>90</sup> The Illyrian movement in Bosnia and Herzegovina was promoted by the Franciscan Ivan Franjo Jukić, who collaborated with Ljudevit Gaj and published texts in his journals, as well as being responsible himself for the first Bosnian-Herzegovinian periodical, *Bosanski prijatelj*. Teinović, *Bosanski franjevci između Gaja i Garašanina*, pp. 43, 48–51.

<sup>91</sup> Grandits, *Multikonfesionalna Hercegovina*, pp. 253–254; Kapidžić, *Alipaša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, pp. 105–106

heirs to the Bosnian land, as a result of the province's historical context.<sup>92</sup> When power changed and Bosnia and Herzegovina passed under the wing of the Catholic Habsburg monarchy, Muslims were no longer satisfied with religion or locality, but had to answer the question their fathers had not asked themselves, namely that of their nationality. However, the answer to this question turned out to be much more difficult than it might have seemed. The first generation of Muslims to begin asking it was a narrow urban elite, mainly from the capital. Its representative was Mehmed bej Kapetanović-Ljubušak, who felt with Croatia not so much a national connection as a cultural one<sup>93</sup>. He was definitely closer to the idea of Slavdom as a community including at least the Slavs of the Balkan peninsula than to Croatian nationalism. Besides, it was Strossmayer himself who wrote in gratitude for a copy of *Narodno blago* that Ljubušak was the spiritual heir of Vuk Karadžić.<sup>94</sup> Having been born at the end of its reign in the Bosnian vilayet, the younger generation essentially no longer remembered the Ottoman Empire and their national identity was formed under the influence of an increasingly Croatian education, as well as a growing number of pro-Croatian societies, which had a significant impact on the formation of the Muslim identity. Ademage Mesić comes to mind as an example of a Muslim Croat; he wrote about the fact that religion and nationality are two different entities because: *by religion we are Muslims, but by nationality and our beautiful language we are Croats. [...] If you ask some Muslims men or women who are you Ahmed or Almasa you must answer I'm a Croatian Muslim.*<sup>95</sup> He was echoed by Osman Nuri Hadžić, who in his pamphlet *Islam and Culture* clearly indicated that it was the "great" Ante Starčević who took Muslims under his protection when the Ottoman Empire withdrew from Bosnia and Herzegovina.<sup>96</sup> Of course, it is difficult to draw any definitive conclusions on the example of Ljubušak or Mesić or Nuri Hadžić, but it would be worth considering the reason for the change that undoubtedly occurred in the mentality of Muslims. The reasons for this should be sought precisely in state education and cultural institutions. Well, schools, reading rooms or societies, meant for the younger generation of Muslims the progress of civilization. Consequently, these institutions were attractive to them because they offered access to Western culture, and it was toward the West, not the East, that the Muslim metropolitan elite in Bosnia and Herzegovina had been looking since 1878. It was in scientific development that the youth professing Islam saw an opportunity

---

<sup>92</sup> Bosnian Muslims, due to the fact that they defended the western borders of the Ottoman Empire, were not generally resettled in other parts of the empire, and moreover, since the empire no longer pursued a policy of expansion, they received as payment for their service the territories where they served, whereby the functions of *kapetans* became hereditary, so to speak.

<sup>93</sup> National and University Library in Sarajevo, Manuscript Collection, Mehmed bej Ljubušak-Kapetanović, sygn. MS 42.

<sup>94</sup> Nadbiskupijski Arhiv Đakovo, HR-NAĐ – 60, pismo J. J. Strossmayera do Mehmed bej Ljubušak-Kapetanović.

<sup>95</sup> Kisić-Kolanović, *Muslimani i hrvatski nacionalizam 1941. – 1945*, p. 84; National and University Library in Zagreb, Manuscript Collection, Ademage Mesić, Memoare vol.2, p. 99, sign. R. 6626.

<sup>96</sup> Hadžić, *Islam i kultura*, pp. 3–4.

to improve the lot of their fellow countrymen. This, among other things, was the purpose of Gajret<sup>97</sup>, which helped and educated Muslims. At the same time, along with the promotion of Western civilization gains, pro-Habsburg propaganda was transmitted, as well as Croatian national ideas.

This situation continued more or less until the end of the 19th century. The first years of the following century brought an offensive of Serbian, as well as Yugoslav national ideas, which provided an interesting alternative to Muslims. This turn can be seen, for example, in the linguistic declarations of students of the Faculty of Law at the University of Vienna, where it was only at the beginning of the 20th century that students professing Islam began to appear, indicating that they used Serbian on a daily basis.<sup>98</sup> The Muslims' turning away from the Croatian national idea was linked to the process of their emancipation. Young people were leaving Bosnia and Herzegovina and going to university, where they came into contact with completely new ideas.<sup>99</sup> In addition, the Serbs took advantage of the growing discontent among the increasingly nationally conscious Muslim elite by pointing out that Western ideas, promoted as the best direction for the followers of Islam from Bosnia and Herzegovina, were not good for them at all. In an anonymous pamphlet from 1900, the author argued bluntly that Muslims who consider themselves Croats are *renegades*,<sup>100</sup> while the secular education encouraged for followers of Islam actually demoralizes the youth and distances them from religion.<sup>101</sup> In addition, another interesting argument appeared in it; the author linked the alleged anti-Muslim measures taken by the state to Croatian national propaganda, pointing out that the state forbids everything Serbian at the same time as promoting everything Croatian,<sup>102</sup> allowing even Jesuit propaganda.<sup>103</sup> The pamphlet was explicitly anti-Habsburg and anti-Croatian, equating both of them to a threat to Bosnian Muslims.

The emergence of the publication at such a time was no coincidence. The growing prevalence of Catholicism in the country, and by extension Croatians, was causing more and more discontent. The Church was a particularly criticized institution. Cases of conversion from Islam to Catholicism ended in loud scandals.<sup>104</sup> It

<sup>97</sup> Gajret was a Muslim organization established in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1903, it was dedicated to supporting the education of Muslims. Cf. Kemura, *Uloga Gajreta na društvenom životu muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine (1903–1941)*.

<sup>98</sup> Mehmedbeg Fidaić, or Dervis Kojtaz, among others, students at the Faculty of Law in Vienna in the academic year 1904/1905.

<sup>99</sup> In the periodical *Behar* a certain Nedim criticized Muslim academic youths for interacting with Orthodox youths, which causes them to start feeling nationally connected to Serbs. This is dangerous for Muslims because they have different national goals than Serbs striving for Greater Serbia. Nedim, Izjava „muslimanske” i pravoslavne omladine, „Behar”, No 7/7 (1906), 73–74.

<sup>100</sup> *Proganjanje islamskog naroda u Herceg-Bosni*, p. 9.

<sup>101</sup> *Proganjanje*, pp. 6–7.

<sup>102</sup> *Proganjanje*, p. 12.

<sup>103</sup> *Proganjanje*, p. 25.

<sup>104</sup> Grijak, *Benjamin Kallay i vrhbosanski nadbiskup Josip Stadler...*, pp. 118–120; Kudelić, *Vjerske konverzije u Bosni i Hercegovini s kraja 19. I početkom XX stoljeća u svjetlu nepoznatog arhivskog gradiva*, pp. 99–110; Gruner, *Glauben im Hinterland. Die Serbisch-Orthodoxen in der habsburgischen Herzegovina 1878–1918*, pp. 197–201.

was also pointed out that the *waqf*<sup>105</sup> had problems maintaining some mosques,<sup>106</sup> while churches and buildings owned by religious congregations increased in number. Croats themselves, too, have often discouraged Bosnian Muslims with their conduct, as in the case of Safet Bej-Bašagić, who complained in a letter to the editors of *Mladost* that other Croatian periodicals refused to publish his writings because of his religion.<sup>107</sup> The turn of some Croatian elites toward the Catholic Church, which took place in Banovina,<sup>108</sup> also affected the situation of Croats in Bosnia and Herzegovina. Croatian Catholics, who were in conflict with each other, were the only ones on the Bosnian-Herzegovinian political scene to have two parties that fought each other. An outside observer such as the district governor from Banja Luka, Franciszek Jakubowski, wrote the following in one of his letters: *Catholics have split into two camps, Zajednica*<sup>109</sup> *and Udruga*<sup>110</sup>. *Zajednica is partisan with the Franciscans, Udruga with Archbishop Stadler and the secular clergy. Each of these factions has its own periodical and they vilify each other in various ways*<sup>111</sup>. *Zajednica is expected to prevail in the Parliament. Mutual envy is so great that this has grated on Rome. Naturally, the Serbs are taking advantage of this. The Muslims have also split into two camps, one holding with the Croats and the other with the Serbs*<sup>112</sup>.<sup>113</sup>

<sup>105</sup> Waqf definition from Britannica: *in Islamic law, a charitable endowment held in trust.* <https://www.britannica.com/topic/waqf>; More about history of bosnian waqf. Hrvačić, *Vakuf – trajno dobro*, pp. 6–11.

<sup>106</sup> ABH, ZVS 1900, ref. 8/125/4.

<sup>107</sup> National and University Library in Zagreb, Manuscript Collection, ref. R 7134 (Letter of Safvet-beg Bašagić sent to the editorial office of *Mladost* on 5 February 1898).

<sup>108</sup> Since the beginning of the 20th century, the Catholic Church in Croatia has been very actively involved in political life in Banovina. Strecha, *Od katoličkog hrvatstva do katoličkog pravaštva*, pp. 103–104.

<sup>109</sup> Here Jakubowski points to the Croatian National Community (Hrvatska Narodna Zajednica), which was founded in early 1908, regarding it as a force for neutralizing the growing Serbian nationalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The party was identified with *Pravaši* and associated with them part of the Croatian intelligentsia working with the Franciscans. Imamović, *Pravni položaj i unutrašnje-politički razvitak BiH od 1878 do 1914*, pp. 207–214.

<sup>110</sup> Croatian Catholic Association (Hrvatska katolička udruga). The party was founded at the end of 1908. Its founder was Archbishop Josip Stadler. In doing so, he wanted to create an alternative to his Croat People's Union (Hrvatska narodna zajednica), with which he was at odds because of the Franciscans. Imamović, *Pravni položaj*, pp. 214–127.

<sup>111</sup> Archbishop Josip Stadler's circle published the periodical *Srce Isusovo*, which was established shortly after the archbishop's arrival in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 1881. Another title coming out under Stadler's auspices was *Vrhbosna*. The Franciscans, in turn, published *Glas Hercegovca* and later also from 1886 onwards *Franjevački Glasnik*. See Kruševac, *Bosansko-hercegovačke listovi u XIX veku*.

<sup>112</sup> Muslims at the time also had their own party, i.e. the Muslim Progressive Party (Muslimanska napredna stranka). However, it did not have the support of all Muslims living in Bosnia and Herzegovina, as party leaders were accused of serving the interests of Austria rather than their community. Therefore, some Muslims preferred to cooperate with Croatian or Serbian parties.

<sup>113</sup> Archiwum Prowincji Polski Południowej Towarzystwa Jezusowego, Correspondence of Marcin Czerminski, Letter from Franciszek Jakubowski, Banja Luka, 30 November 1910, ref. 272/IV

This quote best captures the atmosphere of conflict that existed among Croats. The lack of a coherent message, pro-Serb agitation and, finally, the emergence of the Yugoslav idea, which found adherents especially among the young, resulted in fewer and fewer, especially young people born in the 1870s and 1890s, gravitating toward the Croatian culture. Not insignificant were also voices from the Croatian Banovina, where from 1903 onwards some politicians had pursued the policy of the “New Course,” which meant fighting for common goals shoulder to shoulder between Croats and Serbs.

### **Conclusion**

During Austria-Hungary’s international mandate in Bosnia-Herzegovina, the Croatian diaspora in the country definitely strengthened, which was influenced both by initiatives taken by prominent national activists from Banovina Croatia, as well as from Dalmatia, and by the attitude of the new authorities. The literature often points to the former, but the latter is mentioned rather reluctantly. Moreover, even if it is mentioned, the emphasis is immediately placed on individual cases of the difficulties this group faced from the authorities, rather than attempting a comprehensive analysis of the problem. Such a viewpoint obscures the real picture. Well, the support that Vienna gave to Catholics, and by extension to Croats, is one of the significant factors influencing the strengthening of this national group through its influence in education and culture.

Without the Austro-Hungarian “occupation,” as well as a specific style of government based on supporting weaker national or religious groups at the expense of stronger ones, Croats would certainly not have been so successful. This is especially true in such spheres as education or culture. It was in these areas that the Croatian presence stood out the most. This was because Croatian elites cared, first and foremost, about making Bosnia and Herzegovina culturally closer to them, as they could not, given the political situation at the time, think of a political alliance. It was therefore necessary to approach the problem differently. Therefore, the Croats, realizing the problems facing the occupation authorities, decided to help Vienna, but at the appropriate price of strengthening their influence. Imperial officials, on the other hand, were far more accepting of Croatian aspirations – which for a long time took into account the interests of the empire – than of Orthodox irredentism seeking to detach the province and annex it to the Kingdom of Serbia.

However, this does not imply that the alliance between Vienna and Zagreb that took place in Bosnia-Herzegovina was an easy one. On the contrary, differing national concepts among Croats meant that different political circles presented different, sometimes mutually exclusive, ideas. Additionally, Austro-Hungarian policy towards Bosnia and Herzegovina was not consistent, which resulted in the Croatian national movement being treated instrumentally, allowing it to develop when it was useful to the authorities and impeding its development when the situation in the country made it possible.

## Sources and Literature

### Sources

#### Archival Sources

London

[NAL] - National Archive in London, Letter of British Consul in Sarajevo Edward Freeman to Foreign Office, ref. FO 195/1212.

British Library, Manuscripts, Edward Freeman's Diary, 1875–1879, Add MS 59750.

Banja Luka

[ARSBL] Arhiv Republike Srpske, Kreisbehörde Banja Luka.

Sarajevo

Arhiv Bošnjačkog Instituta im. Zulfikarpašića u Sarajevu, sign. 1/IV/15/6.

National and University Library in Sarajevo, Manuscript Collection, Mehmed bej Ljubušak-Kapetanović, sign. MS 42.

[ABH, ZVS] Arhiv Bosne i Hercegovine, Zemaljska Vlada – Sarajevo.

[HAS] - Historijski Arhiv Sarajeva,

- Porodica Jeftinovići, sign. O-J-283.

- Prva Gimnazija, sign. PG-235

- Privatna Ženska Škola im. Sv. Josipa, , sign. ŽSŠJ-114

Zagreb

[HDA] Hrvatski Držvni Arhiv,

Obiteljski Fond Josip Matasović, sign. HR-HDA, OFJM (1059), kut. 165

Arhiv of Croatian Academy of Science in Zagreb,

Manuscripts, S. S. Kranjcević, sign. HR HAZU/167-21/629

National and University Library in Zagreb, Manuscript Collection,

Ademage Mesić, Memoare Vol.1 and Vol. 2, sign. R. 6626.

Redakcija časopisa „Mladost”, sign. R 7134

Đakovo

Nadbiskupijski Arhiv Đakovo, Letters of Josip Jurij Strossmayer, sign. HR-NAĐ – 60.

Cracow

Archives of the Southern Province of the Society of Jesus, Correspondence of Marcin Czerminski, sign. 272/IV.

#### Edited Sources

*Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina - Ausgabe .1906*, Wien, 1906.

*Bericht über die Verwaltung von Bosnien und der Hercegovina 1914–1916*, Wien, 1917.

*Borba muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine za vjersku i vakufsko-mearifsku autoimiju*, (eds.) Hauptmann Ferdo, Sarajevo, 1967.

*Glasnik zakona i naredaba za Bosnu i Hercegovinu 1885*, Sarajevo, 1886.

Grlović Milan, *Dnevnik* (eds.) Karaula Željko, Zagreb–Križevci, 2020.

Jelica Belović-Bernadzikowska Jelica, *Memoari Jelice Belović-Bernadzikowskoj [Ljube T. Dančić]*, (eds.) Omerović Enes S., Lis Tomasz Jacek, Sarajevo, 2023.



- Korespondencija Rački Strossmayer, Knjiga druga*, (eds.) Ferdo Šišić, Zagreb 1929.
- Martić Grga, *Zapamćenja (1829–1878)*, (eds.) Ferdo Šišić, Zagreb 1906.
- Podaci za proučavanje prosvjetnog rada u Bosni i Hercegovini: referat za "Prosvjetinu" anketu*, Sarajevo, 1911.

### Periodicals

- Nada*, 1896.
- Školski Vjesnik*, 1895
- Behar*, 1906.

### Literature

- [Anonymous]. Nadbiskup Stadler i Franjevci razbistrio Prosperus Dalmata, Spljet 1909.
- Benthke Carl, *Einwanderung und Kolonisten im k.u.k. Bosnien-Herzegowina - Überblick mit 'bosniakischen' Perspektiven*, in: *Bosnien-Herzegowina und Österreich-Ungarn: Annäherungen an eine Kolonie*; eds. Ruthner Clemens, Scheer Tamara, Tübingen 2018, pp. 237–249.
- Biondich Mark, *Stjepan Radic, the Croat Peasant Party, and the Politics of Mass Mobilization, 1904–1928*, London, 2000.
- Blažanović Stjepan, „*Napredak*” u *Zagrebu. Prilozi za monografiju*, Zagreb, 1996.
- Blažević Velimir, *Bosanski franjevci i nadbiskup dr. Josip Stadler*, Sarajevo, 2000.
- Bošnjak Slavoljub, *Zemljopis i povijest Bosne*, Zagreb, 1851.
- Čaušević Dženana, *Pravno-politički razvitak Bosne i Hercegovine. Dokumenti sa komentarima*, Sarajevo, 2005.
- Cetnarowicz Antoni, *Odrodzenie narodowe w Dalmaciji. Od slavenstva do nowoczesnej chorwackiej i serbskiej idei narodowej*, Kraków, 2001.
- Czerwiński Maciej, *Chorwacja. Dzieje, kultura, idee*, Kraków, 2020.
- Đaković Luka, *Političke organizacije bosanskohercegovačkih katolika Hrvata*, Vol. 1, Zagreb, 1985.
- Donia Robert J., *Islam pod dvoglavim orlom: Muslimani Bosne i Hercegovine 1878 – 1914.*, Sarajevo, 2000.
- Dujmović Sonja M., *U ogledalu promjena – Srpsko građanstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini 1918–1941*, Sarajevo, 2019.
- Džaja Srećko, *Bosna i Hercegovina u austrougarskom razdoblju (1878–1918). Inteligencija između tradicije i ideologije*, Mostar–Zagreb, 2002.
- Džanko Muhidin, *Mehmed beg Kapetanović Ljubušak*, Sarajevo, 2008.
- Feldman Andrea, “Kállay’s dilemma on the challenge of creating a manageable identity in Bosnia and Hercegovina (1882–1903)”, *Review of Croatian History*, No 1, (2017), pp. 103–117.
- Gavranović Berislav, *Uspostava redovite katoličke hijerarhije u Bosni i Hercegovini 1881. godine*, Beograd, 1935.
- Grandits Hannes, *Multikonfesionalna Hercegovina - Vlast i lojalnost u kasnoosmanskom društvu*, Sarajevo, 2014.
- Grižak Zoran, “Benjamin Kallay i vrhbosanski nadbiskup Josip Stadler. Problemi katolicizma u Bosni i Hercegovini”, *Prilozi*, No. 33, (2004), pp. 101–133.
- Grižak Zoran, „Benjamin Kallay i vrhbosanski nadbiskup Josip Stadler. Problemi katolicizma u Bosni i Hercegovini”, *Prilozi*, No. 33, (2004), pp. 101–134.
- Gross, Mirijana, „Hrvatska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1878 do 1914”, *Historijski Zbornik*, No. 19-20, (1966-1967), pp. 6–98.
- Gruner Heiner, *Glauben im Hinterland. Die Serbisch-Orthodoxen in der habsburgischen Herzegowina 1878–1918*, Göttingen, 2016.
- Hadžić Nuri Osman, *Islam i kultura*, Zagreb, 1894.

- Hajdarpašić Edin, *Whose Bosnia? Nationalism and Political Imagination in the Balkans, 1840–1914*, London, 2015.
- Hrvatić Esad, *Vakuf – trajno dobro (sa posebnim osvrtom na vakufe u Bosni i Hercegovini)*, Sarajevo, 2001.
- Imamović Mustafa, *Pravni položaj i unutrašnje-politički razvitak BiH od 1878 do 1914*, Sarajevo, 2007.
- Kamberović Husnija, *Begovski zemljišni posjedi u Bosni i Hercegovini od 1878. do 1918. godine*, Sarajevo, 2005.
- Kapidžić Hamdija, *Alipaša Rizvanbegović i njegovo doba*, Sarajevo, 2001.
- Kapidžić Hamdija, *Hercegovački ustanak*, Sarajevo, 1958.
- Karamatić Marko, *Franjevci Bosne Srebrene u vrijeme austrougarske uprave 1878–1914.*, Sarajevo, 1992.
- Kasumović Amila, *Austrougarska trgovinska politika u Bosni i Hercegovini 1878–1914*, Sarajevo, 2016.
- Kasumović Amila, *Priliv činovnika iz Austro-Ugarske u Bosnu i Hercegovinu nakon okupacije 1878*, in: *Zbornik Božene Vranješ-Šoljan. Zbornik radova u povodu 75. Rođendana*, (eds) Domagoj Tončinić, Zagreb, 2022, 89–104.
- Kemura Ibrahim, *Uloga Gajreta na društvenom životu muslimana Bosne i Hercegovine (1903–1941)*, Sarajevo, 1986.
- Kevro Edita, *Nazivi jezika u službenim dokumentima za vrijeme austrougarske vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini*, „Književni jezik”, 28 (2017), 85–117.
- Kisić-Kolanović Nada, *Muslimani i hrvatski nacionalizam 1941. – 1945.*, Zagreb, 2009.
- Klajić Vjekoslav, *Bosna. Podatci o zemljopisu i povijesti Bosne i Hercegovine*, Zagreb, 1878.
- Knežević Antun, *Kratka povijest Kralja Bosanskih*, Dubrovnik, 1884.
- Kruševac Teodor, *Bosansko-hercegovačke listovi u XIX veku*, Sarajevo 1978.
- Kudelić Zlatko, “Vjerske konverzije u Bosni i Hercegovini s kraja 19. i početkom XX stoljeća u svjetlu nepoznatog arhivskog gradiva”, *Croatica Christiana periodica*, Vol. 35/68, (2011), pp. 87–111.
- Lis Tomasz Jacek, *Polscy urzędnicy wyższego szczebla w Bośni i Hercegowinie w latach 1878–1918*, Kraków, 2020.
- Ludwig Steindorff, *Geschichte Kroatiens. Vom Mittelalter bis zur Gegenwart*, Regensburg, 2020.
- Maksim Šobajčić, *Osveta kosovska. Junačke pjesme srpske*, Novi Sad, 1890.
- Mario Strecha, „Od katoličkog hrvatstva do katoličkog pravaštva”, *Radovi Zavoda za hrvatsku povijest Filozofskoga fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu*, Vol. 34–35–36 No. 1, (2004), 101–133.
- Megner Karl, *Beamte. Wirtschafts- und sozialgeschichtliche Aspekte des k. k. Beamtentums*, Wien 1985.
- Moačanin Nenad, *Turska Hrvatska: Hrvati pod vlašću Osmanskoga Carstva do 1791: preispitivanja*, Zagreb, 1999.
- Muraj Aleksandra, „Josip Matasović u svjetlu hrvatske etnologije”, *Etnološka tribina*, No.16, (1993), pp. 11–34.
- Nastić Đorđe, *Jezuite u Bosni*, Beograd, 1906.
- Niškanović Vilma, „Despića kuća i zaostavština porodice Despić u zbirci Muzeja grada Sarajeva”, *Glasnik Zemaljskog Muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine u Sarajevu: Etnologija*, No. 46, (1991), pp. 185–205.
- Okey Robin, *Taming Balkan Nationalism. The Habsburg „Civilizing Mission” in Bosnia, 1878–1914*, Oxford, 2007.
- Omerović Enes S., ‘Odlazak kuferasa’. *Iseljavanje stranaca iz Bosne i Hercegovine neposredno nakon Prvog svjetskog rata.*, in: *Nacije i migracije: Studije iz bosanskohercegovačke historiografije : zbornik radova*, eds. Amir Duranović, Sarajevo, 2019, pp. 69–122.

- Papić Mitar, *Hrvatsko školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini do 1918 godine*, Sarajevo, 1982..
- Papić Mitar, *Školstvo u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme Austrougarske okupacije (1878–1918)*, Sarajevo, 1972. Kruševac Teodor, *Sarajevo pod austro-ugarskom upravom 1878–1918*, Sarajevo, 1960.
- Peco Esad, *Osnovno školstvo u Hercegovini. Za vrijeme austrougarske vlasti 1878–1918*, Sarajevo, 1971.
- Pejanović Đorđe, *Kulturno-prosvjetna humana i socijalna društva u Bosni i Hercegovini za vrijeme austrougarske vladavine*, Sarajevo, 1930.
- Petrović Veljike, *Rodoljubne pjesme*, Beograd, 1900.
- Proganjanje islamskog naroda u Herceg-Bosni*, Novi Sad, 1900.
- Radić Stjepan, *Živio hrvatsko pravo na Bosnu i Hercegovinu*, Zagreb, 1908.
- Radušić Edin, *Upostavljanje austrougarske vlasti u Bosni i Hercegovini prema izvještajima britanskog konzulata u Sarajevu*, in: *Međunarodna konferencija Bosna i Hercegovina u okviru Austro-Ugarske 1978–1918. Zbornik radova*, (eds) Zijad Šehić, Sarajevo, 2011, pp. 33–53.
- Rizvić Muksin, *Bosansko-Muslimanska književnost u doba preporoda 1887–1918*, Sarajevo, 1990.
- Roškiewicz Johann, *Studien über Bosnien und die Herzegovina*, Lipsk-Wien, 1868
- Rumenjak Natalija, “Politička karikatura i slika „Khuenovih Srba” s kraja 19. st. u. Hrvatskoj”, *Časopis za suvremenu povijest*, Vol. 32 No. 3, (2000), 473–486.
- Schmid Ferdinand, *Bosnien und die Herzegovina unter der Verwaltung Oesterreich-Ungarns*, Leipzig, 1914.
- Sugar Peter F., *Industrialization of Bosnia and Herzegovina 1878-1818*, Seattle, 1963.
- Šulek Bogulav, *Hrvatsko-Ugarski ustav ili konstitucija*, Zagreb, 1861.
- Teinović Bratislav, “Bosanski franjevci između Gaja i Garašanina (1836–1849) – suprotnosti dvije nacionalne politike”, *Historijska Traganja*, No. 16, (2015), pp. 31–91.
- Velikonja Mitija, *Religious Separation and Political Intolerance in Bosnia-Herzegovina (Eastern European Studies, 20)*, Texas, 2003.
- Younis Hana, *Biti kadija u kršćanskom carstvu* Sarajevo, 2021.
- Zahra Tara, *Kidnapped Souls: National Indifference and the Battle for Children in the Bohemian Lands, 1900–1948*, Ithaca and London, 2008.
- Zemaljsko Vakufsko Povjerenstvo za Bosnu i Hercegovinu (1890. – 1895.). Analitički inventar*, (eds.) Hodžić Muhamed, Sarajevo, 2014.
- Zgodić Esad, *Ideja bosanske nacije*, Sarajevo, 2008.
- Гильфердинг Александр, *Собрание сочинений А. Гильфердинга*, Vol. 3, Санкт-Петербург, 1873.

## POVZETEK

## Avstrijsko-hrvaški odnosi v habsburški Bosni in Hercegovini

Tomasz Jacek Lis

Okupacija Bosne in Hercegovine je deželi prinesla korenite spremembe. Za učinkovito upravljanje regije in z namenom modernizacije dežele so oblasti so morale vzpostaviti civilno upravo, sodišča, šole in zgraditi mrežo bolnišnic, k čemur so se zavezale v Berlinu. Hkrati so morali spoštovati pravice tamkajšnjega prebivalstva, tudi muslimanov, kar je bilo nekaj novega za cesarja Franca Jožefa I, če upoštevamo večkulturnost avstroogrškega cesarstva.

Znanje jezika večinskega prebivalstva je bil eden od kriterijev za zaposlitev v vojski in v uradih okupacijske oblasti v Bosni in Hercegovini, ki je bila na oblasti od 1878 do 1918. To je še posebej veljalo za učitelje in posameznike z odličnim znanjem hrvaščine ali srbsčine, ki so bili zelo iskani, še posebej v osnovnih šolah. Pridobitev zadostnega števila učiteljev je bil velik izziv, zato jih je vlada Bosne in Hercegovine pripeljala iz sosednjih krajev, predvsem iz Srbije in Hrvaške. Za Hrvate je bila to odlična priložnost za širjenje kulturnega vpliva v Bosni in Hercegovini, saj so menili, da jo je treba povezati s preostalimi hrvaškimi deželami, podobno kot Dalmacijo. Idejo o ponovni združitvi ni bilo mogoče uresničiti zaradi političnih razlogov, ki so bili v nasprotju z interesi monarhije, medtem ko jim je okupacija prinesla edinstveno priložnost za krepitev vpliva v regiji, pri čemer so bile šole zelo učinkovit inštrument.

Hrvati so bili bolj usklajeni z avstrijsko oblastjo od Srbov, ki so ravno tako dobili zaposlitev v šolah v Bosni in Hercegovini. Toda s stališča Dunaja so Srbi predstavljali večjo grožnjo, saj so Hrvati na splošno stremeli k združitvi znotraj habsburške monarhije, medtem ko je bil cilj Srbov odcepitev Bosne in Hercegovine ter njena vključitev v Kraljevino Srbijo. Kot izpostavlja Srećko Đaja, so bili učitelji, ki so jih pripeljali iz Vojvodine, eden od faktorjev, ki so krepili srbski nacionalizem v provinci. Avstrijci niso zgolj pasivno opazovali hrvaške propagande, posredovali so, če so zaznali karkoli, kar bi lahko porušilo relativno ravnotežje, na primer pobude za postavitve spomenikov hrvaškim herojem ali njihovi pretirani promociji.

Posledica izročitve izobraževanja in do neke mere kulture Hrvatom je bila kroatizacija Bosne in Hercegovine. Kazala se je kot nastanek skupine muslimanov, ki so se imeli za pripadnike hrvaškega naroda. Tisti muslimani, ki so se identificirali kot Bošnjaki, torej kot posebna narodnostna skupina, so nasprotovali temu mišljenju kot tudi tisti muslimani, ki so svojo nacionalno identiteto povezovali s Kraljevino Srbijo. Te skupine so imele svoje tiskane medije, kjer so objavljale ostre polemike.

Hrvati niso bili enotni pri svojem delovanju v Bosni in Hercegovini. Bolj posvetne frakcije so sprejemale drugačne izzive in so bile nagnjene k sodelovanju na področju kulture. Islama niso zaznale kot problem in posamezniki kot Safet Beg Bašagić, Osman Nuri Hadžić ali Ademaga Mesić so rade volje sodelovali z njimi in objavljali v hrvaškem časopisju. Hrvaški intelektualci so se pogosto sklicevali na srednjeveško zgodovino in zagovarjali skupne korenine Hrvatov in Bošnjakov. Drugo skupino je sestavljala duhovščina na čelu z nadškofom Josipom Stadlerjem, ki je bil mnenja, da bi bilo treba Bošnjake ponovno pokristjaniti. Njihova radikalna drža in pomanjkljivo razumevanje tradicij in kulture prebivalstva Bosne in Hercegovine je prispevalo k temu, da so na začetku 20. stoletja nekateri muslimani hrvaško identiteto enačili s katolicizmom in ji zato nasprotovali.

Avstrija je ves čas skušala zasledovati svoje cilje. Kjkoli je bilo mogoče, je uporabljala Hrvate v svoj prid kljub pomislekom glede njihovega delovanja, saj jih je v primerjavi s Srbi dojemala kot manjše zlo. Toda Avstrija je bila kritična do kroatizacije muslimanov, saj je verjela, da bi bilo za muslimane v Bosni in Hercegovini najbolje, če bi dobili svojo lastno nacionalno identiteto, drugačno od identitete Hrvatov in Srbov, in tesno sodelovali z oblastjo na Dunaju.

ISSN 0350-5774



9 770350 577002



ZČ | Ljubljana | 78 | 2024 | št. 1-2 (169) | str. 1–262